

## REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-45 are pending in the application. Claims 1-45 have been rejected. Claims 1, 29, and 30 have been amended.

### Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §102.

The Office Action has rejected claims 1-12 and 14-45 under 35 U.S.C. §102 as being anticipated by US Patent 6,247,020 to Minard titled "Development System with Application Browser User Interface" (hereafter, "Minard"). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection for the following reasons.

Claim 1 relates to a method of helping a user learn to implement an application. Minard relates to developing a program. Claim 1 requires presenting an annotation page. Claim 1 specifies that each annotation page includes keyword links, annotation links, detail of implementation of the application of the application and explanation of code used in the application. Minard neither teaches nor suggests "presenting an annotation page." Therefore, it does not anticipate Claim 1.

Minard relates to a development environment for creating application programs. The Office Action contends that Minard discloses presenting an annotation page at col. 11, lines 56-67. That section discusses an "anchor" that is not an annotation page. The section of Minard cited discusses FIG. 4B which shows a browser interface comprising various panes, col. 3, lines 66-67. It only shows a tree structure of files but no explanation of the code. Even though the content pane shows source code lines (col. 11, line 38), there is no explanation shown (as required by claim 1).

Claims 2-28 depend on claim 1 and are patentable over Minard for at least the same reasons that claim 1 is patentable over the cited references.

Claim 29 also requires presenting an annotation page. Claim 29 requires that the annotation page describe a performed application in coordination with performance of the predetermined application. The Office Action does not show how Minard discloses any of the attributes of the claimed annotation page. The Office Action rejected claim 29 on the grounds that "it is individually similar in scope as claim 1 above; therefore, rejected under similar rationale." Applicant respectfully contends that a showing of anticipation requires proof that

an item of prior art discloses every claimed limitation. Even if claim 1 were anticipated (applicant contends otherwise) similarity of scope and a similar rationale that was not even set forth by the Office Action are not enough to support a prima facie case of anticipation.

Claim 30, as amended, requires assembling or global table of contents. The table is based on content in the web-based environment. By contrast the cited part of Minard relates to a content pane that “displays the detailed content of the file selected in the navigation pane.” Col. 10, lines 16-18. That is not the same as being based on the content in the environment and the Office Action has not shown that it is.

Minard also fails to teach or suggest a local table of contents as required by claim 30. The Office Action contends that the local table covers the design tab discussed at col. 10, lines 50-59. A design tab is not the same thing as the claimed local table of contents and the Office Action has not shown that it is.

Claim 31 sets forth a method that requires providing a plurality of predefined interactive examples. Minard neither teaches nor suggests that feature. The Office Action cites Minard at col. 10, lines 50-59. That part of Minard relates to a design tab, and does not show the claimed “providing an interactive example.” Instead, the word “example” appears in the cited section but it refers to an example provided by the Minard patent document not an interactive example provided by any computer program.

Claim 32 relates to a computer system comprising an annotation page. As discussed herein Minard neither teaches nor suggests an annotation page. The claim further provides that different annotations are automatically provided in response to selective execution of a predefined interactive application. No such feature is disclosed or suggested by Minard. The Office Action merely cites the rejections of claims 1 and 31. Applicant respectfully contends that the Office Action has not made out a prima facie case of anticipation.

Claims 33-44 are directly or indirectly dependent on claim 32 and are not anticipated by Minard for the reasons discussed above.

Claim 45 claims a web-based computer system comprising a web-browser window. The Office Action contends that Minard shows this element at cols. 8-12, and figs. 4A-7C (the AppBrowser). The AppBrowser discussed in the cited parts of Minard does not teach or suggest a web-browser that includes a content frame, a framework applet and a table of contents frame as

claimed and the Office Action has not shown that it has. The AppBrowser is shown in FIG. 4A. Note that the claim requires both a content pane and a table of contents frame and the Office Action contends that the content pane 450 corresponds to both, but does not show how this is possible. Therefore the Office Action has not shown anticipation of claim 45.

### **Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103**

The Office Action rejected claim 13 as unpatentable over Minard in view of Beall et al. (U. S. Patent 6,169,992 B1). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

Claim 13, which requires performing the predetermined application, comprises sending a common gateway interface request to a web server that launches the application in a window in the web-based environment. The Office Action concedes that Minard does not disclose the method of sending a common gateway interface request but contends that US Patent 6,169,992 to Beall discloses that feature and that it would have been obvious to combine the teachings of the references “to perform the remote procedure call to be transmitted over the Internet” citing col. 23, lines 5-8. However, the cited portion of Beall does not suggest the desirability of combining a CGI request with the elements of claims 1 and 2. In fact Beall concerns a search engine and does not even discuss an educational program such as that claimed in the present patent application. Therefore, one skilled in the art would not have been motivated to make the claimed combination and thus there has been no prima facie case of obviousness. However, the Office Action contends that Beall et al. teaches this element and that it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to modify Minard according to Beall et al. Applicant respectfully submits that claim 13 would not have been obvious in view of the combination of Minard and Beall et al.

For the foregoing reasons, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the application, allowance of the pending claims, and that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case.

Respectfully submitted,



Michael J. Buchenhorner  
Reg. No. 33,162

Date: October 6, 2003

HOLLAND & KNIGHT LLP  
Holland & Knight LLP  
701 Brickell Avenue, Suite 3000  
Miami, FL 33131  
(305) 789-7773 (voice)  
(305) 789-7799 (fax)

**Certificate of First-Class Mailing**

I hereby certify that this Amendment and Response to Office Action, and any documents referred to as attached therein are being sent by First-Class mailing on this date, October 6, 2003, to the Commissioner for Patents, U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.



Michael J. Buchenhorner, 33,162  
Holland & Knight LLP  
701 Brickell Avenue  
Suite 3000  
Miami, Florida 33131

Date: October 6, 2003